arXiv:1703.08433v1 [cs.DS] 24 Mar 2017

Metric random matchings with applications*

Ching-Lueh Chang †‡

March 27, 2017

Abstract

Let $(\{1,2,\ldots,n\},d)$ be a metric space. We analyze the expected value and the variance of $\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/2\rfloor} d(\boldsymbol{\pi}(2i-1),\boldsymbol{\pi}(2i))$ for a uniformly random permutation $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ of $\{1,2,\ldots,n\}$, leading to the following results:

- Consider the problem of finding a point in $\{1,2,\ldots,n\}$ with the minimum sum of distances to all points. We show that this problem has a randomized algorithm that (1) *always* outputs a $(2+\epsilon)$-approximate solution in expected $O(n/\epsilon^2)$ time and that (2) inherits Indyk's [9, 10] algorithm to output a $(1+\epsilon)$-approximate solution in $O(n/\epsilon^2)$ time with probability $\Omega(1)$, where $\epsilon\in(0,1)$.
- The average distance in $(\{1,2,\ldots,n\},d)$ can be approximated in $O(n/\epsilon)$ time to within a multiplicative factor in $[\,1/2-\epsilon,1\,]$ with probability $1/2+\Omega(1)$, where $\epsilon>0$.
- Assume d to be a graph metric. Then the average distance in $(\{1,2,\ldots,n\},d)$ can be approximated in $O(n)$ time to within a multiplicative factor in $[\,1-\epsilon,1+\epsilon\,]$ with probability $1/2+\Omega(1)$, where $\epsilon=\omega(1/n^{1/4})$.

1 Introduction

A metric space is a nonempty set M endowed with a metric, i.e., a function $d\colon M\times M\to[\,0,\infty\,)$ such that

- $d(x,y)=0$ if and only if $x=y$ (identity of indiscernibles),
- $d(x,y)=d(y,x)$ (symmetry), and

*A preliminary version of this paper appears in https://arxiv.org/abs/1702.03106.

†Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Yuan Ze University, Taoyuan, Taiwan. Email: clchang@saturn.yzu.edu.tw

‡Supported in part by the Ministry of Science and Technology of Taiwan under grant 105-2221-E-155-047-.

- $d(x, y) + d(y, z) \geq d(x, z)$ (triangle inequality)

for all x, y, $z \in M$ [14].

For all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, define $[n] \equiv \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. Given $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and oracle access to a metric $d\colon [n] \times [n] \to [0, \infty)$, METRIC 1-MEDIAN asks for $\operatorname{argmin}_{y \in [n]} \sum_{x \in [n]} d(y, x)$, breaking ties arbitrarily. It generalizes the classical median selection on the real line and has a brute-force $\Theta(n^2)$-time algorithm. More generally, METRIC k-MEDIAN asks for $c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_k \in [n]$ minimizing $\sum_{x \in [n]} \min_{i=1}^{k} d(x, c_i)$. Because $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ defines $\binom{n}{2} = \Theta(n^2)$ nonzero distances, only $o(n^2)$-time algorithms are said to run in sublinear time [9]. For all $\alpha \geq 1$, an α-approximate 1-median is a point $p \in [n]$ satisfying

$$\sum_{x \in [n]} d(p, x) \leq \alpha \cdot \min_{y \in [n]} \sum_{x \in [n]} d(y, x).$$

For all $\epsilon > 0$, METRIC 1-MEDIAN has a Monte Carlo $(1 + \epsilon)$-approximation $O(n/\epsilon^2)$-time algorithm [9, 10]. Guha et al. [8] show that METRIC k-MEDIAN has a Monte Carlo, $O(\exp(O(1/\epsilon)))$-approximation, $O(nk \log n)$-time, $O(n^\epsilon)$-space and one-pass algorithm for all small k as well as a deterministic, $O(\exp(O(1/\epsilon)))$-approximation, $O(n^{1+\epsilon})$-time, $O(n^\epsilon)$-space and one-pass algorithm. Given n points in $\mathbb{R}^D$ with $D \geq 1$, the Monte Carlo algorithms of Kumar et al. [11] find a $(1+\epsilon)$-approximate 1-median in $O(D \cdot \exp(1/\epsilon^{O(1)}))$ time and a $(1+\epsilon)$-approximate solution to METRIC k-MEDIAN in $O(Dn \cdot \exp((k/\epsilon)^{O(1)}))$ time. All randomized $O(1)$-approximation algorithms for METRIC k-MEDIAN take $\Omega(nk)$ time [8, 12]. Chang [3] shows that METRIC 1-MEDIAN has a deterministic, $(2h)$-approximation, $O(hn^{1+1/h})$-time and nonadaptive algorithm for all constants $h \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \setminus \{1\}$, generalizing the results of Chang [2] and Wu [16]. On the other hand, he disproves the existence of deterministic $(2h - \epsilon)$-approximation $O(n^{1+1/(h-1)}/h)$-time algorithms for all constants $h \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \setminus \{1\}$ and $\epsilon > 0$ [4, 5].

In social network analysis, the closeness centrality of a point v is the reciprocal of the average distance from v to all points [15]. So METRIC 1-MEDIAN asks for a point with the maximum closeness centrality. Given oracle access to a graph metric, the Monte-Carlo algorithms of Goldreich and Ron [7] and Eppstein and Wang [6] estimate the closeness centrality of a given point and those of all points, respectively.

All known sublinear-time algorithms for METRIC 1-MEDIAN are either deterministic or Monte Carlo, the latter having a positive probability of failure. For example, Indyk's Monte Carlo $(1 + \epsilon)$-approximation algorithm outputs with a positive probability a solution without approximation guarantees. In contrast, we show that METRIC 1-MEDIAN has a randomized algorithm that *always* outputs a $(2 + \epsilon)$-approximate solution in expected $O(n/\epsilon^2)$ time for all $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. So, excluding the known deterministic algorithms (which are Las Vegas only in the degenerate sense), this paper gives the *first* Las Vegas approximation algorithm for METRIC 1-MEDIAN with an expected sublinear running time. Note that deterministic sublinear-time algorithms for METRIC 1-MEDIAN can be 4-approximate

but not $(4-\epsilon)$-approximate for any constant $\epsilon > 0$ [2, 5]. So our approximation ratio of $2+\epsilon$ beats that of any deterministic sublinear-time algorithm. Inheriting Indyk's algorithm, our algorithm outputs a $(1+\epsilon)$-approximate 1-median in $O(n/\epsilon^2)$ time with probability $\Omega(1)$ for all $\epsilon \in (0,1)$.

Indyk [9, 10] gives a Monte-Carlo $O(n/\epsilon^{3.5})$-time algorithm that approximates the average distance in any metric space $([n], d)$ to within a multiplicative factor in $[\,1-\epsilon, 1+\epsilon\,]$, for all $\epsilon > 0$. Barhum, Goldreich and Shraibman [1] improve Indyk's time complexity of $O(n/\epsilon^{3.5})$ to $O(n/\epsilon^2)$. This paper gives a Monte-Carlo $O(n/\epsilon)$-time algorithm that approximates the average distance in $([n], d)$ to within a multiplicative factor in $[\,1/2-\epsilon, 1\,]$, for all $\epsilon > 0$. For all $\epsilon = \omega(1/n^{1/4})$, we present a Monte-Carlo $O(n)$-time algorithm approximating the average distance of any graph metric to within a multiplicative factor in $[\,1-\epsilon, 1+\epsilon\,]$. But for general metrics, we do not know whether the $O(n/\epsilon^2)$ running time of Barhum, Goldreich and Shraibman can be improved to $O(n/\epsilon^{2-\Omega(1)})$.

2 Definitions and preliminaries

For a metric space $([n], d)$,

$$\bar{r} \equiv \frac{1}{n^2} \cdot \sum_{x,y \in [n]} d\,(x,y)\,, \tag{1}$$

$$p^* \equiv \operatorname*{argmin}_{p \in [n]} \sum_{x \in [n]} d\,(p,x)\,, \tag{2}$$

breaking ties arbitrarily in equation (2). So $\bar{r}$ is the average distance in $([n], d)$, and p^* is a 1-median.

An algorithm A with oracle access to $d\colon [n] \times [n] \to [\,0, \infty\,)$ is denoted by A^d and may query d on any $(x, y) \in [n] \times [n]$ for $d(x, y)$. In this paper, all Landau symbols (such as $O(\cdot)$, $o(\cdot)$, $\Omega(\cdot)$ and $\omega(\cdot)$) are w.r.t. n. The following result is due to Indyk.

Fact 1 ([9, 10])**.** *For all $\epsilon > 0$,* METRIC 1-MEDIAN *has a Monte Carlo $(1+\epsilon)$-approximation $O(n/\epsilon^2)$-time algorithm with a failure probability of at most $1/e$.*

Henceforth, denote Indyk's algorithm in Fact 1 by Indyk median. It is given $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $\epsilon > 0$ and oracle access to a metric $d\colon [n] \times [n] \to [\,0, \infty\,)$. The following fact on estimating the average distance is due to Barhum, Goldreich and Shraibman.

Fact 2 ([1])**.** *Given $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $\epsilon > 0$ and oracle access to a metric $d\colon [n] \times [n] \to [\,0, \infty\,)$, a real number in $[\,(1-\epsilon)\bar{r}, (1+\epsilon)\bar{r}\,]$ can be found in $O(n/\epsilon^2)$ time with probability at least $1/2 + \Omega(1)$.*

Chebyshev's inequality ([13])**.** *Let X be a random variable with a finite expected value and a finite nonzero variance. Then for all $k \geq 1$,*

$$\Pr\left[\,|\,X - \mathrm{E}[X]\,| \geq k\sqrt{\mathrm{var}(X)}\,\right] \leq \frac{1}{k^2}.$$

1: **while** true **do**
2: $z \leftarrow$ Indyk median$^d(n, \epsilon/8)$;
3: Pick independent and uniformly random permutations $\boldsymbol{\pi}_1$, $\boldsymbol{\pi}_2$, ..., $\boldsymbol{\pi}_{80\lceil 1/\epsilon \rceil} \colon [n] \to [n]$;
4: **if** there exists $j \in [\lceil 1/\epsilon \rceil]$ satisfying $\sum_{x\in[n]} d(z,x) \leq (2+\epsilon)\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} d(\boldsymbol{\pi}_j(2i-1), \boldsymbol{\pi}_j(2i))$ **then**
5: **return** z;
6: **end if**
7: **end while**

Figure 1: Algorithm Las Vegas median with oracle access to a metric $d \colon [n] \times [n] \to [0, \infty)$ and with inputs $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $\epsilon \in (0,1)$

3 Las Vegas approximation for metric 1-median selection

This section presents a randomized algorithm that *always* outputs a $(2+\epsilon)$-approximate 1-median, where $\epsilon \in (0,1)$. Clearly,

$$\sum_{x\in[n]} d(p^*, x) \overset{(2)}{=} \min_{p\in[n]} \sum_{x\in[n]} d(p,x) \leq \frac{1}{n} \cdot \sum_{p\in[n]} \sum_{x\in[n]} d(p,x) \overset{(1)}{=} n\bar{r}. \tag{3}$$

For each permutation $\pi \colon [n] \to [n]$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} d(\pi(2i-1), \pi(2i)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} d(p^*, \pi(2i-1)) + d(p^*, \pi(2i)) \leq \sum_{x\in[n]} d(p^*, x), \tag{4}$$

where the first and the second inequalities follow from the triangle inequality and the injectivity of π.

Lemma 3. *When line 5 of* Las Vegas median *in Fig. 1 is run, z is a $(2+\epsilon)$-approximate 1-median.*

Proof. The condition in line 4 of Las Vegas median implies

$$\sum_{x\in[n]} d(z,x) \overset{(4)}{\leq} (2+\epsilon) \sum_{x\in[n]} d(p^*, x) \overset{(2)}{=} (2+\epsilon) \min_{p\in[n]} \sum_{x\in[n]} d(p,x).$$

So when line 5 is run, it returns a $(2+\epsilon)$-approximate 1-median. □

Inequalities (3)–(4) yield the following.

Lemma 4. *For each permutation $\pi \colon [n] \to [n]$,*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} d(\pi(2i-1), \pi(2i)) \leq n\bar{r}.$$

Lemma 5. *For a uniformly random permutation* $\boldsymbol{\pi}\colon [n] \to [n]$,

$$\mathop{\mathrm{E}}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} d\left(\boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2i-1\right), \boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2i\right)\right)\right] = \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor \cdot \frac{n\bar{r}}{n-1}.$$

Proof. For each $i \in [\lfloor n/2 \rfloor]$, $\{\boldsymbol{\pi}(2i-1), \boldsymbol{\pi}(2i)\}$ is a uniformly random size-2 subset of $[n]$, implying

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathop{\mathrm{E}}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}\left[d\left(\boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2i-1\right), \boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2i\right)\right)\right] &= \frac{1}{n\cdot(n-1)} \cdot \sum_{\text{distinct } x,\, y \,\in\, [n]} d\left(x, y\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{n\cdot(n-1)} \cdot \sum_{x,y\in[n]} d\left(x, y\right) \\
&\overset{(1)}{=} \frac{n\bar{r}}{n-1},
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from the identity of indiscernibles. Finally, use the linearity of expectation. □

Lemma 6. *For all* $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ *and in each iteration of the* **while** *loop of* Las Vegas median*,*

$$\Pr\left[\exists j \in \left[80 \cdot \left\lceil \frac{1}{\epsilon} \right\rceil\right], \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} d\left(\boldsymbol{\pi}_j\left(2i-1\right), \boldsymbol{\pi}_j\left(2i\right)\right) \geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\epsilon}{8}\right) n\bar{r}\right] \geq 0.9, \quad (5)$$

where the probability is taken over $\boldsymbol{\pi}_1$, $\boldsymbol{\pi}_2$, …, $\boldsymbol{\pi}_{80\lceil 1/\epsilon \rceil}$ *in line 3 of* Las Vegas median*.*

Proof. Let $\boldsymbol{\pi}\colon [n] \to [n]$ be a uniformly random permutation and

$$\alpha = \Pr_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} d\left(\boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2i-1\right), \boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2i\right)\right) \geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\epsilon}{8}\right) n\bar{r}\right]. \quad (6)$$

So by Lemma 4,

$$\mathop{\mathrm{E}}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} d\left(\boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2i-1\right), \boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2i\right)\right)\right] \leq \alpha n\bar{r} + (1-\alpha)\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\epsilon}{8}\right) n\bar{r}.$$

This and Lemma 5 imply $\alpha \geq \epsilon/8$. So the left-hand side of inequality (5) is at least $1 - (1-\epsilon/8)^{80\lceil 1/\epsilon \rceil} \geq 0.9$. □

Lemma 7. *For all $\epsilon \in (0,1)$ and in each iteration of the* **while** *loop of* Las Vegas median*,*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Pr\left[\left(\sum_{x\in[n]} d(z,x) \le \left(1+\frac{\epsilon}{8}\right)\min_{p\in[n]}\sum_{x\in[n]} d(p,x)\right)\right.\\
&\wedge\left(\exists j \in \left[80\cdot\left\lceil\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right\rceil\right], \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/2\rfloor} d\left(\boldsymbol{\pi}_j(2i-1), \boldsymbol{\pi}_j(2i)\right) \ge \left(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\epsilon}{8}\right)n\bar{r}\right)\\
&\left.\wedge\left(\exists j \in \left[80\cdot\left\lceil\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right\rceil\right], \sum_{x\in[n]} d(z,x) \le (2+\epsilon)\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/2\rfloor} d\left(\boldsymbol{\pi}_j(2i-1), \boldsymbol{\pi}_j(2i)\right)\right)\right]\\
=\ &\frac{1}{2}+\Omega(1), \qquad (7)
\end{aligned}$$

where the probability is taken over $\boldsymbol{\pi}_1$, $\boldsymbol{\pi}_2$, ..., $\boldsymbol{\pi}_{80\lceil 1/\epsilon\rceil}$ and the random coin tosses of Indyk median*.*

Proof. By Fact 1 and line 2 of Las Vegas median, the first condition within $\Pr[\cdot]$ in equation (7) holds with probability at least $1-1/e$ over the random coin tosses of Indyk median. By Lemma 6, the second condition holds with probability at least 0.9 over $\boldsymbol{\pi}_1$, $\boldsymbol{\pi}_2$, ..., $\boldsymbol{\pi}_{80\lceil 1/\epsilon\rceil}$. In summary, the first two conditions hold simultaneously with probability at least $(1-1/e)\cdot 0.9 = 1/2+\Omega(1)$ (note that the random coin tosses of Indyk median are independent of $\boldsymbol{\pi}_1$, $\boldsymbol{\pi}_2$, ..., $\boldsymbol{\pi}_{80\lceil 1/\epsilon\rceil}$). Finally, the first two conditions together imply the third by inequality (3) and the easy fact that

$$\left(1+\frac{\epsilon}{8}\right) \le (2+\epsilon)\left(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\epsilon}{8}\right).$$

□

Theorem 8. *For all $\epsilon \in (0,1)$,* METRIC 1-MEDIAN *has a randomized algorithm that (1)* always *outputs a $(2+\epsilon)$-approximate solution in expected $O(n/\epsilon^2)$ time and (2) outputs a $(1+\epsilon)$-approximate solution in $O(n/\epsilon^2)$ time with probability $\Omega(1)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 7, each execution of lines 4–5 of Las Vegas median returns with probability $1/2+\Omega(1)$. So the expected number of iterations is $O(1)$. By Fact 1, line 2 takes $O(n/\epsilon^2)$ time. Line 3 takes $80\lceil 1/\epsilon\rceil\cdot O(n)$ time by the Knuth shuffle. Clearly, lines 4–5 take $O(n/\epsilon)$ time. In summary, the expected running time of Las Vegas median is $O(1)\cdot O(n/\epsilon^2) = O(n/\epsilon^2)$. To prevent Las Vegas median from running forever, find a 1-median by brute force (which obviously takes $O(n^2)$ time) after n^2 steps of computation. By Lemma 3, Las Vegas median is $(2+\epsilon)$-approximate.

By Lemma 7, z is $(1+\epsilon/8)$-approximate and is also returned in line 5 with probability $\Omega(1)$ in the first (in fact, any) iteration. Finally, the previous paragraph has shown each iteration to take $O(n/\epsilon^2)$ time. □

By Fact 1, Indyk median satisfies condition (2) in Theorem 8. But it does not satisfy condition (1).

We now justify the optimality of the ratio of $2+\epsilon$ in Theorem 8. Let A be a randomized algorithm that always outputs a $(2-\epsilon)$-approximate 1-median. Furthermore, denote by $p \in [n]$ (resp., $Q \subseteq [n] \times [n]$) the output (resp., the set of queries as unordered pairs) of $A^{d_1}(n)$, where d_1 is the discrete metric (i.e., $d_1(x,y) = 1$ and $d_1(x,x) = 0$ for all distinct $x, y \in [n]$). Without loss of generality, assume $(p,y) \in Q$ for all $y \in [n] \setminus \{p\}$ by adding dummy queries. So the queries in Q witness that

$$\sum_{y \in [n] \setminus \{p\}} d_1(p,y) = n-1. \tag{8}$$

Assume without loss of generality that A never queries for the distance from a point to itself.

In the sequel, consider the case that $|Q| < \epsilon \cdot (n-1)^2/8$. By the averaging argument, there exists a point $\hat{p} \in [n] \setminus \{p\}$ involved in at most $2 \cdot |Q|/(n-1)$ queries in Q (note that each query involves two points). Because every function $f\colon [n] \times [n] \to [0, \infty)$ with

$$\{f(x,y) \mid (x,y \in [n]) \wedge (x \neq y)\} \subseteq \left\{\frac{1}{2}, 1\right\}$$

satisfies the triangle inequality, A cannot exclude the possibility that $d_1(\hat{p},y) = 1/2$ for all $y \in [n] \setminus \{\hat{p}\}$ satisfying $(\hat{p},y) \notin Q$. In summary, A cannot rule out the case that

$$\sum_{y \in [n]} d_1(\hat{p},y) \leq \frac{2 \cdot |Q|}{n-1} \cdot 1 + \left(n - 1 - \frac{2 \cdot |Q|}{n-1}\right) \cdot \frac{1}{2} < \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{8}\right) \cdot (n-1). \tag{9}$$

Equations (8)–(9) contradict the guarantee that p is $(2-\epsilon)$-approximate. Consequently, the case that $|Q| < \epsilon \cdot (n-1)^2/8$ should *never* happen. The next theorem summarizes the above.

Theorem 9. METRIC 1-MEDIAN *has no randomized algorithm that always outputs a $(2-\epsilon)$-approximate solution and that makes fewer than $\epsilon \cdot (n-1)^2/8$ queries with a positive probability given oracle access to the discrete metric, for any constant $\epsilon \in (0,1)$.*

Lemmas 4 and 6 yield the following estimation of the average distance.

Theorem 10. *Given $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $\epsilon > 0$ and oracle access to a metric $d\colon [n] \times [n] \to [0, \infty)$, a real number in $[(1/2 - \epsilon)\bar{r}, \bar{r}]$ can be found in $O(n/\epsilon)$ time with probability $1/2 + \Omega(1)$.*

Proof. By Lemmas 4 and 6,

$$\frac{1}{n} \cdot \max_{j \in [80 \cdot \lceil 1/\epsilon \rceil]} \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} d\left(\boldsymbol{\pi}_j\left(2i-1\right), \boldsymbol{\pi}_j\left(2i\right)\right) \in \left[\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\epsilon}{8}\right)\bar{r}, \bar{r}\right] \tag{10}$$

with probability $1/2 + \Omega(1)$. The Knuth shuffle picks $\boldsymbol{\pi}_1$, $\boldsymbol{\pi}_2$, ..., $\boldsymbol{\pi}_{80\lceil 1/\epsilon \rceil}$ in $80\lceil 1/\epsilon \rceil \cdot O(n)$ time. Then the left-hand side of relation (10) can be calculated in $O(n/\epsilon)$ time. □

Note that the estimation of the average distance in Theorem 10 has only one-sided error. The time complexity (resp., approximation ratio) in Theorem 10 is better (resp., worse) than that in Fact 2.

4 Estimating the average distance of a graph metric

Throughout this section, take any $\epsilon = \omega(1/n^{1/4})$ less than a small constant, e.g., $\epsilon = 10^{-100}$. Define

$$\delta \equiv \frac{\epsilon^2}{10^{10}}, \tag{11}$$

$$r \equiv \frac{1}{n} \cdot \sum_{x \in [n]} d\left(p^*, x\right), \tag{12}$$

where p^* is as in equation (2). As $\epsilon = \omega(1/n^{1/4})$, $\delta = \omega(1/\sqrt{n})$ by equation (11).

Lemma 11. $\bar{r} \leq 2r$.

Proof. By equation (1) and the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{r} &\leq \frac{1}{n^2} \cdot \sum_{x,y \in [n]} \left(d\left(p^*, x\right) + d\left(p^*, y\right)\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{n^2} \cdot n \cdot \left(\sum_{x \in [n]} d\left(p^*, x\right) + \sum_{y \in [n]} d\left(p^*, y\right)\right) \\ &= \frac{2}{n} \cdot \sum_{x \in [n]} d\left(p^*, x\right). \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Equations (12)–(13) complete the proof. □

1: Pick a uniformly random permutation $\boldsymbol{\pi}\colon [n] \to [n]$;
2: **return** $\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} d(\boldsymbol{\pi}(2i-1), \boldsymbol{\pi}(2i)) \cdot 2/n$;

Figure 2: Algorithm average distance with oracle access to a metric $d\colon [n] \times [n] \to [0, \infty)$ and with inputs $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $\epsilon = \omega(1/n^{1/4})$.

As in line 1 of average distance in Fig. 2, let $\boldsymbol{\pi}\colon [n] \to [n]$ be a uniformly random permutation. Clearly,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathop{\mathrm{E}}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}\left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} d\left(\boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2i-1\right), \boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2i\right)\right)\right)^2\right] \qquad (14) \\ = & \mathop{\mathrm{E}}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} d\left(\boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2i-1\right), \boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2i\right)\right) \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} d\left(\boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2j-1\right), \boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2j\right)\right)\right] \\ = & \sum_{\text{distinct } i,\, j\, =\, 1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} \mathop{\mathrm{E}}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}\left[\, d\left(\boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2i-1\right), \boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2i\right)\right) \cdot d\left(\boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2j-1\right), \boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2j\right)\right)\right] \\ + & \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} \mathop{\mathrm{E}}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}\left[\, d^2\left(\boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2i-1\right), \boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2i\right)\right)\right], \qquad (15) \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the linearity of expectation and the separation of pairs (i, j) according to whether $i = j$. The next three lemmas analyze the variance of

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} d\left(\boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2i-1\right), \boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2i\right)\right).$$

Lemma 12.

$$\sum_{\text{distinct } i,\, j\, =\, 1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} \mathop{\mathrm{E}}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}\left[\, d\left(\boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2i-1\right), \boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2i\right)\right) \cdot d\left(\boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2j-1\right), \boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2j\right)\right)\right] \leq \frac{1}{4} \cdot \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\right) n^2 \bar{r}^2.$$

Proof. Pick any distinct $i, j \in [\, \lfloor n/2 \rfloor\,]$. Clearly,

$$\left\{\boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2i-1\right), \boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2i\right), \boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2j-1\right), \boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2j\right)\right\}$$

is a uniformly random size-4 subset of $[n]$. So

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathop{\mathrm{E}}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}\left[\, d\left(\boldsymbol{\pi}(2i-1), \boldsymbol{\pi}(2i)\right) \cdot d\left(\boldsymbol{\pi}(2j-1), \boldsymbol{\pi}(2j)\right)\right] \\ = & \frac{1}{n \cdot (n-1) \cdot (n-2) \cdot (n-3)} \cdot \sum_{\text{distinct } u,\, v,\, x,\, y\, \in\, [n]} d\left(u, v\right) \cdot d\left(x, y\right). \end{aligned}$$

Clearly,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\text{distinct } u,\, v,\, x,\, y \,\in\, [n]} d\left(u,v\right)\cdot d\left(x,y\right) &\leq \sum_{u,v,x,y\in[n]} d\left(u,v\right)\cdot d\left(x,y\right)\\ &= \sum_{u,v\in[n]} d\left(u,v\right)\cdot \sum_{x,y\in[n]} d\left(x,y\right)\\ &= \left(\sum_{x,y\in[n]} d\left(x,y\right)\right)^{2}.\end{aligned}$$

In summary,

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{\text{distinct } i,\, j \,=\, 1}^{\lfloor n/2\rfloor} \mathop{\mathrm{E}}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}\left[\, d\left(\boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2i-1\right),\boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2i\right)\right)\cdot d\left(\boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2j-1\right),\boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2j\right)\right)\right]\\ \leq\ &\left\lfloor\frac{n}{2}\right\rfloor\left(\left\lfloor\frac{n}{2}\right\rfloor-1\right)\cdot\frac{1}{n\cdot(n-1)\cdot(n-2)\cdot(n-3)}\cdot\left(\sum_{x,y\in[n]} d\left(x,y\right)\right)^{2}.\end{aligned}$$

This and equation (1) complete the proof. □

Define

$$\Delta \equiv \max_{x,y\in[n]} d(x,y)$$

to be the diameter of $([n],d)$.

Lemma 13. *If*

$$\delta n r \geq \Delta \tag{16}$$

then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/2\rfloor} \mathop{\mathrm{E}}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}\left[\, d^{2}\left(\boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2i-1\right),\boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2i\right)\right)\right] \leq \left(\frac{1}{2}+O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\right)\left(\delta n^{2} r\bar{r}+\delta^{2} n r^{2}\right). \tag{17}$$

Proof. Clearly, $\{\boldsymbol{\pi}(2i-1),\boldsymbol{\pi}(2i)\}$ is a uniformly random size-2 subset of $[n]$ for each $i\in[\,\lfloor n/2\rfloor\,]$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/2\rfloor} \mathop{\mathrm{E}}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}\left[\, d^{2}\left(\boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2i-1\right),\boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2i\right)\right)\right] &= \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/2\rfloor}\frac{1}{n\cdot(n-1)}\cdot\sum_{\text{distinct } x,\, y\,\in\,[n]} d^{2}\left(x,y\right) \qquad (18)\\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/2\rfloor}\frac{1}{n\cdot(n-1)}\cdot\sum_{x,y\in[n]} d^{2}\left(x,y\right)\\ &= \left\lfloor\frac{n}{2}\right\rfloor\cdot\frac{1}{n\cdot(n-1)}\cdot\sum_{x,y\in[n]} d^{2}\left(x,y\right).\end{aligned}$$

By inequality (16),

$$d(x, y) \leq \delta n r \tag{19}$$

for all x, $y \in [n]$.

By equations (1) and (18)–(19), the left-hand side of inequality (17) cannot exceed the optimal value of the following problem, called MAX SQUARE SUM:

Find $d_{x,y} \in \mathbb{R}$ for all x, $y \in [n]$ to maximize

$$\left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor \cdot \frac{1}{n \cdot (n-1)} \cdot \sum_{x,y \in [n]} d_{x,y}^2 \tag{20}$$

subject to

$$\frac{1}{n^2} \cdot \sum_{x,y \in [n]} d_{x,y} = \bar{r}, \tag{21}$$

$$\forall x, y \in [n],\ 0 \leq d_{x,y} \leq \delta n r. \tag{22}$$

Above, constraint (21) (resp., (22)) mimics equation (1) (resp., inequality (19) and the non-negativeness of distances). Appendix A bounds the optimal value of MAX SQUARE SUM from above by

$$\left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor \frac{1}{n \cdot (n-1)} \cdot \left(\left\lfloor \frac{n\bar{r}}{\delta r} \right\rfloor + 1 \right) \cdot (\delta n r)^2 .$$

This evaluates to be at most

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} + O\left(\frac{1}{n} \right) \right) \left(\delta n^2 r \bar{r} + \delta^2 n r^2 \right) .$$

□

Recall that the variance of any random variable X equals $\mathrm{E}[X^2] - (\mathrm{E}[X])^2$.

Lemma 14. *If $\delta n r \geq \Delta$, then*

$$\operatorname*{var}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} d\left(\boldsymbol{\pi}(2i-1), \boldsymbol{\pi}(2i) \right) \right) \leq (1 + o(1))\, \delta n^2 r^2 .$$

Proof. By equations (14)–(15) and Lemmas 12–13,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathop{\mathrm{E}}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} d\left(\boldsymbol{\pi}(2i-1), \boldsymbol{\pi}(2i) \right) \right)^2 \right] \\ \leq\ & \frac{1}{4} \cdot \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{n} \right) \right) n^2 \bar{r}^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2} + O\left(\frac{1}{n} \right) \right) \left(\delta n^2 r \bar{r} + \delta^2 n r^2 \right) . \end{aligned}$$

This and Lemma 5 imply

$$\begin{aligned}&\operatorname*{var}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/2\rfloor} d\left(\boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2i-1\right),\boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2i\right)\right)\right)\\ \leq\ & O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\cdot n^2\bar{r}^2+\left(\frac{1}{2}+O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\right)\left(\delta n^2 r\bar{r}+\delta^2 n r^2\right).\end{aligned}$$

Finally, invoke Lemma 11 and recall that $\delta=\omega(1/\sqrt{n})$. □

Lemma 15. *If $\delta nr\geq\Delta$, then*

$$\Pr_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}\left[\left|\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/2\rfloor} d\left(\boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2i-1\right),\boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2i\right)\right)\right)-\frac{1}{2}\cdot\left(1\pm O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\right)n\bar{r}\right|\geq k\sqrt{(1+o(1))\,\delta}\,nr\right]\leq\frac{1}{k^2}$$

for all $k>1$.

Proof. Use Chebyshev's inequality and Lemmas 5 and 14. □

Lemma 16. *If $\delta nr\geq\Delta$, then*

$$\Pr_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}\left[\left|\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/2\rfloor} d\left(\boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2i-1\right),\boldsymbol{\pi}\left(2i\right)\right)\right)-\frac{1}{2}\cdot\left(1\pm O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\right)n\bar{r}\right|\geq k\sqrt{(1+o(1))\,\delta}\,n\bar{r}\right]\leq\frac{1}{k^2}$$

for all $k>1$.

Proof. By inequalities (3) and (12),

$$r\leq\bar{r}.$$

This and Lemma 15 complete the proof. □

We now arrive at an efficient estimation of the average distance on a graph.

Theorem 17. *Given $n\in\mathbb{Z}^+$, $\epsilon=\omega(1/n^{1/4})$ and oracle access to a graph metric $d\colon[n]\times[n]\to\mathbb{N}$, a real number in $[\,(1-\epsilon)\bar{r},(1+\epsilon)\bar{r}\,]$ can be found in $O(n)$ time with probability $1/2+\Omega(1)$.*

Proof. Let $G=([n],E)$ be an undirected unweighted graph inducing the distance function d. Then pick $x,\,y\in[n]$ with $d(x,y)=\Delta$, i.e., (x,y) is a furthest pair of vertices of G. Find a simple shortest x-y path, denoted $(v_0=x,v_1,\ldots,v_\Delta=y)$, in G. By equation (12),

$$r\geq\frac{1}{n}\cdot\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta} d\left(p^*,v_i\right). \tag{23}$$

Now,

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta} d\left(p^*, v_i\right) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{\Delta} d\left(p^*, v_i\right) + d\left(p^*, v_{\Delta - i}\right) \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{\Delta} d\left(v_i, v_{\Delta - i}\right) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{\Delta} \left| \Delta - 2i \right| \geq \frac{\Delta^2}{4}, \tag{24}$$

where the first inequality (resp., the second equality) follows from the triangle inequality (resp., $(v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_\Delta)$ being a shortest v_0-v_Δ path).[1] By inequalities (23)–(24),

$$nr \geq \frac{\Delta^2}{4}. \tag{25}$$

Because d is a graph metric, $d(x, y) \geq 1$ for all distinct x, $y \in [n]$. So by equation (12),

$$r \geq \frac{1}{n} \cdot \sum_{x \in [n] \setminus \{p^*\}} 1 \geq \frac{1}{2} \tag{26}$$

for all $n \geq 2$.

By inequalities (25)–(26),

$$\delta n r \geq \delta \cdot \max\left\{ \frac{\Delta^2}{4}, \frac{n}{2} \right\}.$$

So

$$\delta n r \geq \Delta \tag{27}$$

for all sufficiently large n.[2] By equation (11),

$$3\sqrt{(1 + o(1))\,\delta} \leq 0.1\,\epsilon \tag{28}$$

for all sufficiently large n. By inequalities (27)–(28), Lemma 16 with $k = 3$ and recalling that $\epsilon = \omega(1/n^{1/4})$,

$$\Pr_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} d\left(\boldsymbol{\pi}(2i-1), \boldsymbol{\pi}(2i)\right) \in \left[\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) n\bar{r}, \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) n\bar{r} \right] \right] \geq 1 - \frac{1}{9} \tag{29}$$

for all sufficiently large n. Consequently, the output of line 2 of average distance in Fig. 2 is in $[\,(1-\epsilon)\bar{r}, (1+\epsilon)\bar{r}\,]$ with probability $1/2 + \Omega(1)$. Line 1 takes $O(n)$ time by the Knuth shuffle. Clearly, line 2 also takes $O(n)$ time. □

The time complexity of $O(n)$ in Theorem 17 is independent of ϵ. But for general metrics, we do not know whether the time complexity of $O(n/\epsilon^2)$ in Fact 2 can be improved to $O(n/\epsilon^{2-\Omega(1)})$.

[1] It is easy to verify that $\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta} |\,\Delta - 2i\,| = (\Delta+2)\Delta/2$ if $\Delta \equiv 0 \pmod 2$ and $\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta} |\,\Delta - 2i\,| = (\Delta+1)^2/2$ otherwise.

[2] If $\Delta \geq 4/\delta$, then $\delta\Delta^2/4 \geq \Delta$. Otherwise, $\delta n/2 \geq \Delta$ for all $n > 8/\delta^2$. Finally, recall that $\delta = \omega(1/\sqrt{n})$.

A Analyzing MAX SQUARE SUM

MAX SQUARE SUM has an optimal solution, denoted $\{\tilde{d}_{x,y} \in \mathbb{R}\}_{x,y\in[n]}$, because its feasible solutions (i.e., those satisfying constraints (21)–(22)) form a closed and bounded subset of $\mathbb{R}^{(n^2)}$. (Recall from elementary mathematical analysis that a continuous real-valued function on a closed and bounded subset of $\mathbb{R}^k$ has a maximum value, where $k < \infty$.) Note that $\{\tilde{d}_{x,y} \in \mathbb{R}\}_{x,y\in[n]}$ must be feasible to MAX SQUARE SUM. Below is a consequence of constraint (21).

Lemma A.1.

$$\left|\left\{(x,y) \in [n] \times [n] \mid \tilde{d}_{x,y} = \delta nr\right\}\right| \leq \left\lfloor \frac{n\bar{r}}{\delta r} \right\rfloor. \tag{30}$$

Proof. Clearly,

$$n^2\bar{r} \overset{(21)}{=} \sum_{x,y\in[n]} \tilde{d}_{x,y} \geq \left|\left\{(x,y) \in [n] \times [n] \mid \tilde{d}_{x,y} = \delta nr\right\}\right| \cdot \delta nr.$$

Furthermore, the left-hand side of inequality (30) is an integer. □

Lemma A.2.

$$\left|\left\{(x,y) \in [n] \times [n] \mid \tilde{d}_{x,y} > 0\right\}\right| \leq \left\lfloor \frac{n\bar{r}}{\delta r} \right\rfloor + 1.$$

Proof. Assume otherwise. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left|\left\{(x,y) \in [n] \times [n] \mid \left(\tilde{d}_{x,y} > 0\right) \wedge \left(\tilde{d}_{x,y} \neq \delta nr\right)\right\}\right| \\
\geq\ & \left|\left\{(x,y) \in [n] \times [n] \mid \tilde{d}_{x,y} > 0\right\}\right| - \left|\left\{(x,y) \in [n] \times [n] \mid \tilde{d}_{x,y} = \delta nr\right\}\right| \\
\geq\ & \left\lfloor \frac{n\bar{r}}{\delta r} \right\rfloor + 2 - \left|\left\{(x,y) \in [n] \times [n] \mid \tilde{d}_{x,y} = \delta nr\right\}\right| \\
\overset{\text{Lemma A.1}}{\geq}\ & 2.
\end{aligned}$$

So by constraint (22) (and the feasibility of $\{\tilde{d}_{x,y}\}_{x,y\in[n]}$ to MAX SQUARE SUM),

$$\left|\left\{(x,y) \in [n] \times [n] \mid 0 < \tilde{d}_{x,y} < \delta nr\right\}\right| \geq 2.$$

Consequently, there exist distinct (x',y'), $(x'',y'') \in [n] \times [n]$ satisfying

$$0 < \tilde{d}_{x',y'},\ \tilde{d}_{x'',y''} < \delta nr. \tag{31}$$

By symmetry, assume $\tilde{d}_{x',y'} \geq \tilde{d}_{x'',y''}$. By inequality (31), there exists a small real number $\beta > 0$ such that increasing $\tilde{d}_{x',y'}$ by β and simultaneously decreasing

$\tilde{d}_{x'',y''}$ by β will preserve constraints (21)–(22). I.e., the solution $\{\hat{d}_{x,y} \in \mathbb{R}\}_{x,y\in[n]}$ defined below is feasible to MAX SQUARE SUM:

$$\hat{d}_{x,y} = \begin{cases} \tilde{d}_{x',y'} + \beta, & \text{if } (x,y) = (x',y'), \\ \tilde{d}_{x'',y''} - \beta, & \text{if } (x,y) = (x'',y''), \\ \tilde{d}_{x,y}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{32}$$

Clearly, objective (20) w.r.t. $\{\hat{d}_{x,y}\}_{x,y\in[n]}$ exceeds that w.r.t. $\{\tilde{d}_{x,y}\}_{x,y\in[n]}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor \cdot \frac{1}{n\cdot(n-1)} \cdot \sum_{x,y\in[n]} \left(\hat{d}_{x,y}^2 - \tilde{d}_{x,y}^2 \right) \\ \overset{(32)}{=} & \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor \cdot \frac{1}{n\cdot(n-1)} \cdot \left(\left(\tilde{d}_{x',y'} + \beta \right)^2 + \left(\tilde{d}_{x'',y''} - \beta \right)^2 - \tilde{d}_{x',y'}^2 - \tilde{d}_{x'',y''}^2 \right) \\ = & \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor \cdot \frac{1}{n\cdot(n-1)} \cdot \left(2\beta\tilde{d}_{x',y'} - 2\beta\tilde{d}_{x'',y''} + 2\beta^2 \right) \\ > & \ 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality holds because $\tilde{d}_{x',y'} \geq \tilde{d}_{x'',y''}$ and $\beta > 0$.

In summary, $\{\hat{d}_{x,y}\}_{x,y\in[n]}$ is a feasible solution to MAX SQUARE SUM achieving a greater objective (20) than the optimal solution $\{\tilde{d}_{x,y}\}_{x,y\in[n]}$ does, a contradiction. □

We now bound the optimal value of MAX SQUARE SUM.

Theorem A.3. *The optimal value of* MAX SQUARE SUM *is at most*

$$\left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor \cdot \frac{1}{n\cdot(n-1)} \cdot \left(\left\lfloor \frac{n\bar{r}}{\delta r} \right\rfloor + 1 \right) \cdot (\delta n r)^2$$

Proof. W.r.t. the optimal (and thus feasible) solution $\{\tilde{d}_{x,y}\}_{x,y\in[n]}$, objective (20) equals

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor \cdot \frac{1}{n\cdot(n-1)} \cdot \sum_{x,y\in[n]} \chi\left[\tilde{d}_{x,y} \neq 0 \right] \cdot \tilde{d}_{x,y}^2 \\ \overset{(22)}{\leq} & \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor \cdot \frac{1}{n\cdot(n-1)} \cdot \sum_{x,y\in[n]} \chi\left[\tilde{d}_{x,y} > 0 \right] \cdot (\delta n r)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\chi[P] = 1$ if P is true and $\chi[P] = 0$ otherwise, for any predicate P. Now invoke Lemma A.2. □

References

[1] K. Barhum, O. Goldreich, and A. Shraibman. On approximating the average distance between points. In *Proceedings of the 10th International Workshop on Approximation and the 11th International Workshop on Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization*, pages 296–310, 2007.

[2] C.-L. Chang. Deterministic sublinear-time approximations for metric 1-median selection. *Information Processing Letters*, 113(8):288–292, 2013.

[3] C.-L. Chang. A deterministic sublinear-time nonadaptive algorithm for metric 1-median selection. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 602:149–157, 2015.

[4] C.-L. Chang. Metric 1-median selection: Query complexity vs. approximation ratio. In *Proceedings of the 22nd International Computing and Combinatorics Conference*, pages 131–142, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam, 2016. Full version at https://arxiv.org/abs/1509.05662.

[5] C.-L. Chang. A lower bound for metric 1-median selection. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 84:44–51, 2017.

[6] D. Eppstein and J. Wang. Fast approximation of centrality. *Journal of Graph Algorithms and Applications*, 8(1):39–45, 2004.

[7] O. Goldreich and D. Ron. Approximating average parameters of graphs. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 32(4):473–493, 2008.

[8] S. Guha, A. Meyerson, N. Mishra, R. Motwani, and L. O'Callaghan. Clustering data streams: Theory and practice. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 15(3):515–528, 2003.

[9] P. Indyk. Sublinear time algorithms for metric space problems. In *Proceedings of the 31st Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 428–434, 1999.

[10] P. Indyk. *High-dimensional computational geometry*. PhD thesis, Stanford University, 2000.

[11] A. Kumar, Y. Sabharwal, and S. Sen. Linear-time approximation schemes for clustering problems in any dimensions. *Journal of the ACM*, 57(2):5, 2010.

[12] R. R. Mettu and C. G. Plaxton. Optimal time bounds for approximate clustering. *Machine Learning*, 56(1–3):35–60, 2004.

[13] R. Motwani and P. Raghavan. *Randomized Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1995.

[14] W. Rudin. *Principles of Mathematical Analysis*. McGraw-Hill, 3rd edition, 1976.

[15] S. Wasserman and K. Faust. *Social Network Analysis: Methods and Applications*. Cambridge University Press, 1994.

[16] B.-Y. Wu. On approximating metric 1-median in sublinear time. *Information Processing Letters*, 114(4):163–166, 2014.